



KNOWLEDGE . . . LIBERTY . . . UTILITY . . . REPRESENTATION . . . RESPONSIBILITY.

VOL. I.

PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER 20, 1834.

NO. 14.

To the Editor of the W. Review:

Sir,—I am pleased to see that you have given the biographical sketch of the late Thomas Hardeman a place in your last number; and indulge the hope that the old man's wishes may be gratified by a notice of his opinions, you will find a condensed expression of opinions in a letter addressed to his son Constantine. A more able and elaborate expression of opinion is contained in a paper directed to his old friend F. D.

So fearful was the old man that some opposing spirit might say, after his death, that he had recanted his opinions, that he required of his son, Mr. B. Hardeman, to be always with him when he received company.

AVONARE.

BOLIVAR, Hardeman County Tenn. Jan. 16th, 1832.

MY DEAR SON,—When I have employed all the mental faculties of mind which I am possessed of, in the inquiry and investigation of truth, it appears to me that matter, with all its various modes of operation, is all that finite human intelligence can possibly take cognizance of. And when we extend our inquiries beyond the material system, we have then got beyond our comprehension, into a wide field of doubtful disquisition and uncertainty, where all is mere conjecture and guess work. We are endowed with five natural senses, to wit: seeing, smelling, hearing, tasting, and feeling, which make up our whole portion. We cannot conceive nor desire any thing beyond them. Were a man born without any of the five natural senses, he would, could he live, be totally void of any senses. It is by the senses only that we gain any knowledge of them. The number of ideas presented to the understanding, through the medium of the senses approaches nearly to infinite. But I will only remark on the sense of feeling. If no feeling, no idea of pain; and where there is no feeling, no punishment can possibly be inflicted. These are among the impossibilities. I am aware of the common error, among the vulgar, that all things are possible with God, which is a grand mistake. He cannot produce his equal, neither can he destroy his own existence: he must eternally remain the First Cause and immutable support of all existence. Were he to fail, a wreck of matter and a crush of worlds would immediately follow. Besides, such a catastrophe would prove him imperfect. When the five natural senses are extended, as far as they are susceptible, we have no further means of knowledge; and as none of them are of a spiritual or supernatural quality, the idea of divine inspiration, (fabricated by priests for their own interest) is entirely above their capacity, for want of a faculty of mind of a supernatural quality, through which such celestial intelligence can only be received. Upon this subject a certain author observes—"The assumption of a new faculty of mind, called inspiration, is practised by all priests and teachers, from the Lapland magi to the civilized pope. And if it were not an insult to good sense to attempt a refutation of such absurdity by arguments, he would observe that inspiration, in proportion as it approaches, and identifies with Deity, the common source, the diversity of its streams, are augmented. The inspired Catholic abhors the inspired Protestant, the Protestant the inspired Jew, the Jew the Mahomedan; and when these bedlamites break loose, they burn their victims at opposite piles, despising that inspiration in others which they rage with themselves. I know but one remedy for this moral pestilence of superstition, which is, to assemble the inspired idiots of all countries, that, in the view of their convulsions, contortions, and delirious ravings in the presence of each other, would exhibit the portraiture of folly in so strong a light, that reason would burst her sides with laughter, and judgment must be restored.

If inspiration were a faculty of mind, founded in truth, it would be uniformly the same—it would not embrace so many divers and contradictory creeds.

If the fate of all finite beings are inevitable, what can be the duty required of them? Entire submission and conformity to those infinitely wise and immutable laws by which all terrestrial things are governed.

I cannot conceive how an entirely perfect and unchangeable being can be served, praised or glorified, without pride, ostenta-

tion, or vanity of some kind which would diminish his perfections, and expose the ignorance of any being who would presume to make the attempt. It is evident that such a being has every thing to give and nothing to receive. And, consequently, the idea is a mere fabrication. Is it reasonable to believe that the plans of infinite wisdom can be changed by insignificant and vain prayers, or that information can possibly be given that was not already known.

It is evident we are fated beings, and determined by the unalterable laws of fate; and we must submit to our destiny, however disagreeable it may be to our feelings. I have said, where there is no feeling, no punishment can possibly be inflicted. This sentiment will hold good with respect to a soul, formed of immaterials—substance without matter, existence without body, life without organs or sensations. Such are the immaterials of a soul incapable of punishment.

The doctrine of the trinity: the incomprehensible union of three persons in the Godhead is equally fallacious. That one single essence can be divided into three equal parts, and when so divided each a whole essence, and unite them again, and be but one, baffles numerical calculation, and the powers of common sense. But I believe the more inconsistent, and the greater the absurdity, the more merit the professing zealots, in the Christian religion, claim to themselves in believing it.

Your affectionate father,

THOMAS HARDEMAN.

CONSTANTINE HARDEMAN.

From the Farmer & Gardener.

SOAP—Potash, soda and amonia, are called alcalies; the two first fixed and the last a volatile alkali. Soda is obtained from the ashes of plants growing in or near the sea, and is hence called the marine alkali.

Amonia is the result of animal fermentation, and is consequently forming in great quantities under a great variety of circumstances, from many of which the most valuable manures are formed, but which unfortunately are lost as fast as formed from its volatile character and the ignorance of its nature and the modes of retaining and applying it.

Either of the alcalies, when combined with oil and water, form soap. Potash is the alkali used in soft soap, and soda forms hard soap. Soap formed by amonia is sometimes called volatile lineament.

The process of forming soap of any kind is founded on the fact, that an alkali has an attraction, both for water and oil, and hence unites these two opposing substances with itself and with each other.

If the alkali, oil and water are in a pure state, they always form a chemical union when brought into contact, and result in this useful article in domestic economy and personal cleanliness.

The cause of failures in soap making, is always some acid, salt or other foreign ingredient, mixed with one or more of the three substances requisite for the work. Carbonic acid, sometimes called fixed air, is perhaps the most common cause of failure in this useful domestic art. As the carbonic acid gas, exists at all times and in all places in the atmosphere, it readily and, almost necessarily combines with the potash contained in ashes, as they are produced by the process of combustion. Hence, the potash obtained from the leaching of ashes, is not a pure alkali, but a salt called by chemists, the carbonate of potash.

If new burnt lime be mixed with the ashes while leaching, the carbonic acid leaves the potash and combines with the lime, making the carbonate of lime and leaving the potash more nearly a pure alkali, and of course possessing a stronger attraction, both for water and oil. Hence the use of putting a little of quick lime into leaching tubs with the ashes, or rather beneath the ashes.

The cause of failures in soap boiling is sometimes in the oil or grease; generally perhaps the salt mixed with it during the process of cooping or preserving. This may be removed by water;

as salt is soluble in water, which does not combine with the oil by the simple process of boiling. Hence if the soap grease be largely charged with fresh water once boiled, before it is mixed with the other two ingredients for forming soap, it will be freed from its salt, and possibly a failure of success by that means prevented.

Although salt when combined with grease, frequently prevents the success of the soap boiler, in many manufactories it is used in large quantities in the making of soap. The two cases, however, are entirely distinct, and have no connection with each other. When salt is used by soap boilers, it is for changing soft soap into hard soap; in other words to give soda the place of the potash in the soap already formed.

Salt is the muriate of soda, or muriatic acid and soda. The muriatic acid has a stronger attraction for potash, than for soda; consequently, when the salt is put into the soap containing potash, forming the muriate of potash in a liquid state, called waste ley; the salt and the soap hence change their partners, the one taking the potash, the other the soda; in other words, the muriatic acid takes the potash from the soap, and gives in exchange the soda, which forms soft soap into hard soap.

MEETINGS.

Democratic Ward Associations.

SPRING GARDEN.—DEMOCRATIC DISTRICT MEETING.—Arise Democrats, and to your posts! Your country is in danger: Fly to the rescue of your liberty!—The Democratic citizens of the District of Spring Garden, friends of General Michael W. Ash, and opposed to that dangerous enemy of liberty, the United States Bank, and its aristocratic supporters, will meet at the large and extensive Drove Yard Hotel, of Daniel Hotz, corner of Seventh and Callowhill streets, on Monday evening, 23d inst. at half past seven o'clock.

Freemen, attend! and show the enemies of your country and its liberty, a phalanx of stout hearts, determined to maintain their rights against Bank tyranny and aristocratic oppression. Every Democrat is called upon to attend, as the Meeting will be addressed by a number of our distinguished fellow citizens.

By order of the General Committee.

GEO. W. RITER, Ch'n.

T. M. RUSH, Secretary.

NORTH MULBERRY WARD.—The Democratic Citizens of this Ward, will meet at the house of Abraham Lockridge, Race street wharf, Schuylkill, on Monday evening, 23d inst. at half past seven o'clock, on business of importance.

SOUTHWARK.—Jackson, Democracy, and no Bank.—The Democrats of Southwark, friendly to the General and State Administrations, will meet at the Southwark Hall, on Thursday evening, the 2d of October, at 7 o'clock.

MIDDLE WARD.—The Democratic Citizens of this Ward will meet at the house of J. Ossenkirck, (formerly Wampole's) south-east corner of Eleventh and Market streets, on Monday evening, 23d inst. at seven and a-half o'clock, for the purpose of nominating suitable persons to serve as Assessor and Assistant Assessors, and Inspectors of the General Election. An attendance of the Block Committees, is also particularly requested.

By order of the Delegates.

LOWER DELAWARE WARD.—Meet at H. Meyers', corner of Fifth and Race streets, on Wednesday evening, 21th inst. at half past seven o'clock, for the purpose of nominating an Assessor, two Assistant Assessors, and Inspectors of the General Election.

DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE OF SUPERINTENDENCE.

The Committee will meet at Holahan's, THIS evening, 20th inst. at seven and a-half o'clock.

S. PORTER, Chairman.

THOS. B. TOWN, } Secretaries.

WM. VODGES, }

GENERAL WARD COMMITTEE.

The Democratic General Ward Committee, will meet by adjournment, at the Supreme Court Room, on MONDAY, Sept. 22, at seven and a-half o'clock, P. M.

F. STOEVEER, Ch'n. pro. tem.

J. A. PHILLIPS, } Secretaries.

V. L. BRADBORD, }



PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM DUANE.

PHILADELPHIA, SEPT. 20, 1834.

WHAT IS BANKING?

There are many varieties of *Banks*—and they are denominated by their modes of business.

Originally, and in some parts of the world, it continues so to this day—a man planted a *bench* (*banco*), in the public market, on which he placed piles of different kinds of money: and this money he exchanged for foreign money—or he accepted and paid *bills* or *drafts* from distant places, for which he charged a certain *rate* for the service he rendered.

In a more advanced stage, another degree in banking arose; the banker *drew drafts* on time, at distant places, where he had established a previous understanding and credit with another banker; and the business was found so convenient, and generally useful, as to constitute a separate business.

Another kind of banking arose, called *banks of deposit*. In these, men who had more money than was necessary for immediate use, *deposited* their money for safety.

This branch of banking was extended to paying interest two or three per cent. for money deposited; this money was lent out at five, or more per cent; so that the banker made his business of other people's money; and the depositor and banker were satisfied.

The Bank of Amsterdam, very celebrated for its opulence, and the ruin of Holland, was a *bank of deposit*—that is, it received gold and silver in deposit, but never paid any out. On the deposit being made, the bank issued a *certificate* for the sum, and the bank, by a refined contrivance, kept its certificates at *par*, that is, of equal credit in mercantile transactions, with gold or silver.

The trick of the bank was much similar to that narrated by *Silas Broughs*, of New York, in the process by which stock was *kept up*, at the time of the veto.

As the Bank of Amsterdam always received its own certificates, upon a small deduction, say half per cent. there could be no greater depreciation. If the market was glutted, a *committee* having always the surveillance of the market, bought in at *par*, sometimes one, two, or three per cent. above, when a great speculation was to be promoted—thus giving the paper a forced credit; and so the paper always obtained goods, though it could not procure money.

It is not to the present purpose to pursue this *bank* to its ultimate ruin, like that of Venice, of which it was an imitation.

Banking was the first gangrene, which destroyed liberty, in these celebrated republics.

Many other varieties of banks exist; and banks of deposit, and of exchange, when honorably conducted, are of great benefit to business, domestic and foreign.

Now, it is the practice of those who *cheat the public* on the banking subject, to confound the various kinds, and vindicate the *abuses* under color of the *uses*.

The public generally, know very little of the matter. The *books* and *lectures* on the subject, are published either by *parties in the fraud*, or by men imperfectly, or not at all, acquainted with the subject; and the *editors of papers* are generally *wholly ignorant*, or not sufficiently impressed with the importance of right knowledge.

With this explanation in brief, we may go at once to the *root of the evil*—such as is exemplified in the *BANK OF THE UNITED STATES*.

All those descriptions of banking above noticed, are

conducted without *charters*, upon the individual credit of the banker or firm. Such were the banking houses of the Great German House, of Fuggers, Childs & Co. Coutts, and others of London. No man was under any obligation to take their drafts or notes; they were responsible to no other law, than those of honor and probity, common to all dealings between man and man; they issued no paper with the *audacious lie*, calling it *money*—a term which applies only to coin of gold or silver. Their credit was good—it required no fallacy to sustain it; and their estates were liable like those of men who are not bankers, for their debts.

Every civilized nation coins money of *gold* and *silver*. Mints are established to fulfil this duty of coining money,—it being essential to social prosperity, that property should always maintain an uniform value; and this could be done by no other means, than by establishing a *standard*; to which, whoever bought or sold anything, or wished to know the worth of anything intended to be bought or sold, could directly refer, and ascertain at once the value required.

We say this could be done by no other means than coin of gold or silver. It was only requisite to say—an ounce of pure gold is every where in the civilized world, desired and acceptable as an equivalent for any exchangeable thing whatever; and so of any number of ounces or parts of an ounce.

Nothing can be, and it is a *falsehood* to denominate anything as, *money*, which is not gold or silver; the word *money* signifies what it is, the *unit*, that to which is referred the quantity of gold or silver in coin; and any thing destitute of those properties which make gold and silver universally desired and accepted in exchange, cannot be money—and must therefore be a *fraud*.

Now we come to the *immediate* source and cause of the evils which have so recently disturbed the whole country, and while the panic lasted threatened its prosperity, with a fall similar to what befel the *Venetian* and *Dutch Republics*, in which some *hundred* rapacious families monopolized the public riches, and plunged the great mass of the people in slavery and poverty, from which they have never been extricated.

The American Republic was menaced with a similar fate. At this very day the *Bank of the United States* is depriving men of industry of their bread, because they dare to hold an opinion in support of the Government of their country. This is the plain fact, no gloss can be put on it. Let us now see how this power of generating public slavery was brought about—the very moment we wrote to this point, an article from another paper caught our attention—and we shall adopt it here:

FIRST BANK OF THE UNITED STATES—BORN IN CORRUPTION, FRAUD, AND OPPRESSION.—HISTORICAL RECOLLECTIONS.

From Mr. Jefferson's Works, vol. 4, pages 446, 7, 8, 9.

"I returned from that mission [the French] in the first year of the New Government, and proceeded to New York, March, '90, to enter on the office of Secretary of State. Here, certainly, I found a state of things which, of all I had ever contemplated, I the least expected. . . . Politics were the chief topic; and a preference of *kingly over republican government*, was evidently the favorite sentiment. . . . HAMILTON's financial system had then passed. It had two objects. 1. As a puzzle, to exclude popular understanding and inquiry. 2. As a machine for the corruption of the Legislature." . . . "It is well known, during the war, the greatest difficulty we encountered was the want of money or means to pay our soldiers who fought, or our farmers, manufacturers, and merchants, who furnished the necessary supplies of food and clothing for them. After the expedient of paper money had exhausted itself, *certificates* of debt were given to the individual creditors, with assurances of payment as soon as the United States should be able.—But the distresses of the People often obliged them to part with these for the half, the fifth, and even the tenth of their value; and speculators had made a trade of cozening them from the holders by the most fraudulent practices, and persuasion that they would never be paid. (Hamilton determined to *fund* these certificates, that is to say, to convert them into stock, payable by

the Federal Government, at a future day, and bearing interest.) In the bill for *funding* them, Hamilton made no difference between the original holders, and the fraudulent purchasers of this paper. . . . When the trial of strength, on these several efforts, had indicated the *form* in which the bill would finally pass, this being known within doors (of Congress) sooner than without, and in the distant parts of the Union, THE BANK SCRAMBLE BEGAN! *Couriers and relay horses by land, and swift sailing pilot boats by sea were flying in all directions.* Active partners, and agents, were associated and employed in every State, town, and county neighborhood, and this paper was bought up as low as five shillings, and even two shillings in the pound, before the holder knew that Congress had already provided for its redemption at *par*."

(NOTE.—Two millions of these certificates were received at *par* and interest in payment of stock in the first United States Bank, and the members of Congress and their connexions who had got the certificates out of the hands of the People for five shillings, or two and six pence in the pound and the interest for an average of eight or nine years, making ten shillings more; and then created the Bank of the United States, and subscribed two millions of stock, which brought, for twenty years, upwards of 8 per cent. and then left a large surplus to divide! Thus, 2 and 6 pence, converted into 30 shillings, by legislation, drew 12 per cent. interest on every 30 shillings! *Quere.* How much per cent. was that on the 5 shillings, or 2 shillings actually paid? This was called the Funding Act.)

"This game (the funding scheme) was over, and another on the carpet at the moment of my arrival; and to this I was ignorantly and innocently made to hold the candle. This fiscal manœuvre is well known by the name of the *Assumption*."

* * * This measure produced the most bitter and angry contests ever known in Congress, before or since the union of the States. I arrived in the midst of it,—but a stranger to the ground, and to the actors in it, and as yet unaware of its object, I took no concern in it."

(Mr. Jefferson then relates how the bill for the Assumption, after being lost in the House of Representatives by one vote, was finally passed, by fixing the seat of Government on the Potomac, and thereby getting two Potomac members to change their votes on the Assumption bill. By this bill twenty millions of new debt was assumed by the Federal Government, and the same game, though not to the same extent, played, of Congressional stock jobbing. Mr. Jefferson says:—)

"And so the Assumption was passed, twenty millions of stock divided among the favored States, and thrown in as a *pabulum* to the stockjobbing herd." * * * "I know very well, and so must be understood, that nothing like a majority in Congress had yielded to this corruption. Far from it. But a division, not very unequal, had already taken place in the honest part of this body, between the parties styled Republican and Federal. * * * Still the machine was not complete. The effect of the Funding System, and of the Assumption, would be temporary; it would be lost with the loss of the individual members which it had enriched, and some ENGINE of influence more PERMANENT, must be CONTRIVED while these myrmidons were yet in place to carry it through all opposition. THIS ENGINE WAS THE BANK OF THE UNITED STATES."

"The history of this is known." p. 449.

(Mr. Jefferson here alludes to what was universally known in his time, that the Bank bill was carried by corrupt stock jobbing, founded upon the three great stock bills; the Funding Act, the Assumption Act, and the Bank Act.)

"While the Government remained at Philadelphia, a selection of *Members of both Houses* were constantly kept as *Directors*, who, on every question interesting to the Bank, or the views of the Federal head (Hamilton) voted at the will of the head, and together with the stock-holding members, could always make the Federal vote that of the majority. By this combination Legislative expositions were given to the Constitution, and all Administration laws were shaped on the model of England, and so passed." p. 440.

Such is the narrative of Jefferson, given to the world, after his death, and intended as a solemn legacy to the Republicans of the United States. Such is his testimony, and what Republican can dispute it? From this testimony, it is clear that the first Bank of the United States was born of corruption, fraud, and oppression! That it grew out of a combination of the most corrupt acts that ever passed Congress, and is indissolubly connected with the notorious and scandalous plunder of the Soldiers of the Revolution, by which they were cheated out of certificates at 5 shillings and 2 shillings in the pound, when every pound of which they were thus robbed was converted into a public debt at 30 shillings, and bore interest, and two millions of it became capital in the stock of the first bank. Yet this is the Bank which is quoted as the con-

stitutional precedent for the present Bank! In one point of view it is a proper precedent for the present one; in its stock jobbing, its frauds, its corruptions, and its notorious influence in Congress through stock-holding, stock-jobbing, debtor members, and feed attorneys. In this the two banks are identical; and in 1830, 31, 2, 3, 4, as in 1791, 92, 3, 4, a mercenary squad of Bank stipendiaries, and Bank retainers, are able to lead a great political party against the Republicans; and by the multitude of their newspapers, writers, and speakers, to maintain a powerful party in every State to fight for the Bank and its paper currency against the Constitution, the friends of the country, and the gold and silver currency which the Constitution guaranteed to the People.

"The Permanent Engine of Corruption" is now at work,—and has for its supporters the same black-cockade Federalists who contrived it in 1791. The first engine, as Mr. Jefferson proves, worked the process of corruption with dire effect in 1791–2–3; the second engine works it still more effectually now. The two Houses of Congress—the public press—the elections—and the State Legislatures, are the places at which this permanent engine now works, day and night; and every where has secured its "mercenary squad" to do its bidding, and who receive, without shame, the wages of prostitution, in the shape of loans and fees, and pretended payments for jobs of printing, insignificant law suits, travelling expenses, and compensation for journeys of pleasure and amusement, affected to be done for the service of the Bank.

The Republicans of 1811 broke to pieces this engine of corruption; but the pieces have been re-united. Will the republicans of 1834 so effectually break it up again as that the pieces can never be re-united? Not even by the Senate Committee, whose anticipated report has already emboldened the divan of corruptionists in their late triennial meeting in Philadelphia, to direct an application for a re-charter!

Quere. Did not that triennial meeting know precisely what report the Senate Committee is to make, when they thus, to the astonishment of the country, authorize an open application for a new charter, at the very moment that their adherents and pensioners in all parts of the Union, were crying out that the question of recharter was done with forever! Nothing but a knowledge of the report which the Committee is to make, could have encouraged them to this boldness, and to this palpable contradiction of their adherents and pensioners.

Here we have it, in terms more expressive, and from authority which is above doubt.

We see that the Bank was generated by politicians who preferred royalty to republican government.

That it was intended as a puzzle, and has ever since continued as a puzzle to popular understanding.

That it was a machine to corrupt the Legislature, and do we not see that it has succeeded in wielding a majority of 26 in the United States Senate; and a *minor phalanx* in the House of Representatives.

Do we not see that this Bank intended to corrupt the Legislature, was part of the machinery which cheated the soldiers of the Revolution out of their hard earned pay.

Do we not see that the Legislature, within the last five years, endeavored by extravagant appropriations, to prevent the payment of the public debt; read the above extracts carefully, and you will find the word MONSTER a title appropriate.

Well, these striking traits do not yet unravel the mode nor the manner, in which the outrage upon the constitution and the country operated.

We have frequently stated the mode and manner; but it is difficult to bring men to think in opposition to a prejudice; it is difficult to persuade men they do not know every thing; and men of a certain calibre are apt to conclude that because they are personally acquainted with a man, that his acquaintance understands any subject better than himself; besides there are numbers who borrow light from their neighbor's lanterns, and who think the sun borrows its light at those lanterns.

Well, we do not fear to speak to those people, and say, you are dupes! None of you can expect to live an hundred years, and many of you will leave families who are to become the future People; we say to you, are you so lost to the recollections of the War of Independence and the rights of mankind, as to consign your posterity to be slaves, as the Bankers of Venice consigned the Democracy of that splendid Republic.

If you are not so base, read and judge before God, what is your duty to your country, your own happiness, and that of your posterity.

The Constitution assigned to Congress the functions of sovereignty in the coinage, with the exclusive power of regulating it; and the laws consequent of this power, absolutely declared that coin of gold and silver alone should be money.

The law went further; it made the debasing of the coin, or a false coinage, a felonious offence.

Be it never lost sight of, that money of a permanent, invariable, and universal nature, is indispensable to the permanency of property, and the certainty of exchanges; and these are the sole purposes of a coinage.

Well we now know what banks were; how they began; what was their purpose. It was to the interest of the good condition of society that moral character should be the foundation of credit between man and man; upon that foundation the exchanges of the whole world have been, and in the greater part of the world continue to be, carried on; that is, the private credit of private houses, holding for their universal regulator, gold and silver. For the transactions of the whole world are founded upon gold and silver.

In this state of the world, our government came into being. In the Convention it was proposed to invest Congress with the power to grant charters—the proposition was rejected; and among the reasons for rejecting it, one reason was, that under such a power they might erect a bank, such as had destroyed Venetian and Dutch liberty!

The advocates of monarchy happened to obtain high places in the new government, and the counsels of foreign baronets had no small share in promoting and shaping the measures for a Bank, a funding system, and a stock-jobbing aristocracy!

In defiance of the rejection by the Convention, the bill for a Bank was brought in, and it was passed.

What was the character of this transaction?

1. It violated the Constitution, which declared gold and silver to be the only measure of value.
2. It violated the faith pledged to the country, that gold and silver should be the only measure of credit and exchange.
3. It violated the Constitution by vesting the power in a number of unknown persons to render the coinage nugatory.
4. It authorized persons unknown to issue pieces of paper in lieu of money.
5. The persons thus invested were not made responsible for any crimes they might commit; a wretch who should coin a bad dollar was a felon, but a company of felons who issued pieces of painted rags, worth nothing intrinsically, were authorized to purchase and raise, or put down the whole industry and commerce of this vast continent.
6. The law made those rag representatives receivable as money, in violation of the coinage.
7. The law made this original outrage—the depository of the public revenue—and enabled it to agitate the whole country.
8. It vested this unconstitutional power, without requiring that those so vested should be responsible in their estates for any of their acts; therefore making them a privileged order, exempt from the operation of law.
9. It vested in this unconstitutional body, the power of receiving and trading upon the public revenues without any proportionate benefit for the privilege.
10. It vested in this unconstitutional body the credit derived from the public, being an owner of stock.
11. It enabled this unconstitutional body to perpetrate great public mischiefs which could not be effected, were gold and silver only the current medium of exchange.
12. As the influx of an excess of the precious metals

over the calls of circulation, it is agreed on all hands, must affect prices, by competition; and as a scarcity of the precious metals must raise prices,—this institution was invested with powers to produce similar effects, whenever it should find it profitable to spread temptation and ruin in society.

13. When paper was thus authorized to be substituted for gold by a WICKED UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW, the whole property of society was placed at the capricious discretion, or the mercenary avidity of this unconstitutional monster!

14. GOLD AND SILVER being the sole currency, those mischiefs could not be practised, because the general commerce of the world, required a constant circulation, and it was not in the power of human wit to augment the quantity circulating in the world; it being not a production of art but a bounty of nature.

15. But this monster of wicked invention, having no restraint of nature or law—and being invested with a power of declaring and uttering promises to pay gold, as if the paper on which the promise was printed was gold; and the capacity to increase the quantity of paper pictures of promises to pay to any extent—the faculty to create having no natural limitation or extent.

16. Then as an excess of gold or silver would reduce prices, and a scarcity augment prices, this unconstitutional Bank was invested with a power to do that with paper which the laws of nature interdicted as to the precious metals.

17. The American people have seen, that this Bank has issued excessive quantities of paper, and that it refuses to pay gold for its promises.

18. The American people have seen the whole action of society paralyzed, by the despotic artifices of the Bank.

19. The process of degradation of the working classes, as it was perpetrated in Venice, has been going on, and is now in operation to influence and control the elections of a free people.

20. Freemen are divested of their sacred rights—their bread wrested from their mouths—their families deprived of support, because they will not surrender their right of suffrage to this unnatural monster, because they will not betray their country, their sacred rights, and become the trained band of an enemy to the government and the prosperity of this free nation.

The Bank law was an *ex post facto* contrary to the Constitution, inasmuch as having pledged the government to sustain the universal medium of gold and silver, it authorized the substitution of rags.

It invested a company of unknown, irresponsible men, with functions which the Constitution had withheld from the states—the issuing of bills of credit.

Can it be wonderful that men invested with such inordinate powers of accumulation, and of practising fraud upon the country, are loth to part with it, or that they would plunge the country in ruin rather than lose it?—But the game is up.

PERSECUTIONS OF EDITORS IN FRANCE.

M. Bascans, responsible editor of the Tribune, was lately set at liberty, after thirty-two month's imprisonment: He had undergone sixty-five prosecutions, three capital, and 50,000 francs fine. What a blessed protector of the press is Louis Philippe, the republican King of the Barricades.

M. BASCANS appears to have published a sort of Aurora; but the Editor of the Philadelphia Aurora, beat the French in number of prosecutions, as 83 to 65; but M. Bascans beat, in the period of imprisonment by 30 months, for the Aurora Editor was imprisoned only twice; once for 30 days, and the second for only 2 hours. In the Reign of Terror, we were not much better off than the Editors under the King of the Barricades.

It is amusing *now* (it was not very amusing *then*) to refer to the *crimes* of those days. One of the crimes for which thirty days were awarded, was this:—A suit had been instituted for some charge under the Sedition law, the case being in court, the usage *under common law* is not to disturb by the Press, questions pending before a court; the Editor of the *U. S. Gazette*, which was the organ of the Tories of that day, took up the case, in which the Editor of the *Aurora* was the accused, and entered as largely into the case as a *well-feed lawyer*, defending a desperate case. Every thing was in the hands of the Tories of that day—the courts—the lawyers—the counter-jumping juries, grand and petit, were selected by sheriffs obedient to faction, and the discussions in the *U. S. Gazette* were well adapted to fill the minds of the jurors with a pre-judgment of the cause.

The *pet press* of the judges having made the trespass on *common law*, the Editor of the *Aurora* did not hold back, but met the challenge in the same open and free way—this was the *crime*, a good Federal lawyer moved an arrest for *contempt of court*, in this vindication against the attacks of the *U. States Gazette*, and the Editor was brought up thereupon.

Counsel for the defendant argued the justification of a reply to a wanton and aggravating attack; the usual plea of *no offence intended*, and as it is called, purging upon oath, which oath was made, but the court itself wanted purging, (and it was afterwards purged pretty well,) the Editor was sentenced to thirty days imprisonment—which he spent in the intercourse of friends.

But the best part of this *federal joke* was, that the court was moved to issue a similar writ against the Editor of the *United States Gazette*, who had begun the war against the *common law*. But though the publication was proved, nay, that it was the provocation to the defence for which the Editor of the *Aurora* had been imprisoned—the court required *no purge*.

The Democratic reader will learn from the result of this *contemptible* abuse of judicial power, subservient to an anti-social faction, of which all the judges of that day were fanatical devotees, the advantages of a free representative government: this *law* (which was *no law*) of contempt had been carried to the usual extravagance of *federalism*, and this case of the *only editor* who dared to assert the principles of "1776," excited a proportionate indignation, the contrast being so striking of the *impunity* with which the *United States Gazette* discussed the case before the courts, while the Editor of the *Aurora* barely defended himself, and was imprisoned for so doing—from the evil arose a durable and effective good—a law of a few lines put an end to this *figment* of barbarous ages and arbitrary wrong.

ACT.—3d APRIL, 1809.

§1. The power of the Judges of the several Courts to issue attachments, and inflict summary punishments, for *contempt of Court*, shall be restricted to the official misconduct of Officers of Court, &c.

§2. All publications out of Court, respecting the conduct of the Judges, Officers of Court, &c. shall not be construed into contempt; nor shall render the author, printer or publisher, liable to attachment, &c.

The second case is perhaps as curious! The *Mayor* of that day received some sort of charge against the Editor of the *Aurora*, on the part of the then well known *Chevalier Yrujo*, Minister of Spain, for what we never could learn; the chief constable of the day made the arrest, and the Editor waited on the *Mayor*, when the colloquy following took place:

EDITOR.—I am here, sir, in consequence of your notice—what is the charge and who is the accuser?

MAYOR.—You are accused by the Chevalier Yrujo—and oath has been made before me.

EDITOR.—By whom and for doing what?

MAYOR.—It is no matter—you must find five thousand dollars bail—or go to jail.

EDITOR.—What sir—bail for I know not what—and sworn to by I know not whom!—confront me with the witness.

MAYOR.—No sir, I am satisfied—you must give bail or go to jail.

EDITOR.—Then sir, I refuse to give bail—and if you choose to commit me, though the act will be in you illegal, I will carry the commitment myself.

The *Mayor* had made out the *commitment* beforehand, and the Editor took it to the keeper of the city prison, and surrendered himself into custody therefor, resolved to abide the issue, whatever it might be.

He had not mentioned one word of the matter to any one on his transit; but in about an hour the late *Pierce Butler* presented himself as a visitor, and learned the facts as here stated; in about twenty minutes a writ of *habeas corpus* carried the Editor before the judge, and Mr. Butler said he was ready to become bail in one hundred thousand dollars, if necessary; but wished to hear the cause of commitment; and the question being simply narrated, the judge thought fit, in order to let the *mayor off*, to postpone the consideration to another day, directing the *prisoner* to go home to his business.

But the matter never came up before the judge again!

The Editor however, brought an action against the *Mayor*, and obtained a verdict of a Sheriff's jury for three hundred dollars and costs—which the Editor declined to take or sue out—justice and right being his objects, not money.

EDUCATION.

A law was passed at the last session of the Legislature of this Commonwealth, for establishing *schools* in districts designated, and upon terms unusual. We have no doubt of the good and upright intentions of the projector of this plan; but with the best intentions in the world, Mr. BRECK, has mistaken, as thousands besides him have mistaken, the *means of Education* among the classes of the people who stand most in need of guidance in the road to knowledge.

Men should first consider *how* the young should be instructed, and in *what*. It is not enough to say there shall be a house built in every township, &c. children of tender age may be gathered together, and *some poor devil* who cannot get his bread in any other way, placed in charge of those young persons who are to be the people in less than 20 years.

In short, all the existing systems in practice, are little more than *teaching youth ignorance*.

The people of a district, themselves viciously instructed, meet to provide *instruction and instructors*, and ignorance is propagated from generation to generation.

We have no present means of ascertaining the immensity of the sum appropriated to the purposes of Education in this Commonwealth, but it is immense.

And where do we discern the evidence of success in the application of this beneficence? It is not to be discovered. Schools have been *jobs*, or the mediums of vanity or patronage to some few men in every district. Very few of those who are placed in charge of districts, or in charge of schools, have any *rational ideas of education*. Some there are who would limit knowledge to classes; no one inquires as to what belongs to the business of life, or how to ascertain what is best. To some, *Noah Webster's* distortion of the English tongue is the perfection of *SCHOOLING*; some indeed think that reading and writing may be enough; but the summit of all scholastic acquirement are the *three rules* of arithmetic!

Well, by the new law schools are provided, and we here see what they promise to be.

But, it seems, a special clause of the law excluded the city and county of Philadelphia from its *benefits*, if any.

The sheriff imagined the law operative here, and proclaimed the election for yesterday; but after publication it was discovered that Philadelphia city and county were excluded.

On the part of those excepted districts, whatever the intention was, the effect has been good. We have schools in abundance, but knowledge it not proportionately dif-

fused. We shall not now enquire into the motives for excepting to this law in Philadelphia city and county. If it was a good law, or a wise law, or a law by which sound education might be developed, certainly here there was the best chance, in liberal hands, to approach what was good.

We cannot but remark that laws are too frequently passed, of which the *public concerned know nothing*, till they are to be enforced; and this law, which it seems was originally intended to comprehend the city, is one of those *forced laws*, of which we shall say something more another time.

The *New York American*, speaking of the recent arrests, for mail depredations, of the Post Master and Assistant Postmaster, at *Wythe Court House*, Virginia, says—

"The *Globe* does not mention whether these were Jackson appointments."

Thus implying that if a felony were committed, the head of the administration from which the appointments issued, would be responsible. We have made inquiry for the satisfaction of the *New York American*, and are enabled to inform him, that the Postmaster in question was appointed under the administration of John Quincy Adams, on the 25th of May, 1827, and that the Assistant was appointed by his principal, according to usage.—The Editor of the *American* will please make the most favorable implication, consistent with his *charitable feelings*.—*Globe*.

From the *Globe*.

MAINE ELECTIONS.

In our article of yesterday, instead of every *township* to be heard from, it should have been printed every *county* "in Hall's, in Jarvis's, &c. district will increase the Democratic majority." One other mistake. It was the *New York Commercial Advertiser*, edited by the notorious Stone, instead of the *Boston Courier*, its Wig brother, that thus showed "its wrath at the result in Maine:—"

"MAINE ELECTIONS.—As we expected, the elections in Maine have gone for the Tories. On the whole, we don't know but we are rather sorry that Jackson and Van Buren were not allowed to sell that State to Great Britain, when they were attempting to dispose of a pretty good slice of it, two or three years ago."

The real truth is, that it was Mr. Adams's and Clay's reference, and the award of their arbitrator that threatened Maine with a loss of part of her territory, and which Gen. Jackson's administration has thus far prevented. The People of Maine, however, will now see who are their sincere friends, and that the Bank organs wish them to lose the whole of their State to the British!!

We have in Maine another sample of "great re-actions every where." Our Governor is elected by a much larger majority than he was last year. So far Dunlap's majority over Sprague is 3172. Last year our majority was less than 3000. Dunlap's majority over all others is now 2431. Last year it was about 500. Such re-actions are always welcome. Will the Banktake an Ex-President's advice, a friend of that institution, too, and "give it up!"

The subjoined gratifying intelligence is from the *N. Y. Evening Post*:—

"A letter from a writer of the greatest respectability, dated Bangor, September 13th, says, 'We have elected Dunlap, our candidate for Governor, by about 4000 majority, which is an increase from the last election! In the district represented by Mr. McIntyre, there is now no choice, owing to our two friends having run. The difficulty, however, will be adjusted, and a friend of the administration chosen, the district having a majority of over 1100. Jarvis, Hall, Mason, Smith, Evans, and Parks, are re-elected. Report says Kavanagh is run down, which I think probable, as his district always contained a strong majority against us, and he was elected on account of his great personal popularity, and a division among our opponents. We have a decided majority in both branches of the legislature; and Mr. Sprague's fate is sealed forever.'"

Another letter from Maine, of the same date with the foregoing, holds the following language: "It gives me pleasure to forward to you papers containing lists of votes, and to assure you that we have carried our Governor, both branches of the legislature, and shall have six out of eight members of Congress. I regret exceedingly that Mr. Kavanagh has lost his election. His district has always been against us, and he was chosen by his own great popularity and a division amongst our opponents. Maine was never sounder or stronger than she is now."

REVIEW.

GOLD CURRENCY.

A LECTURE ON MONEY AND CURRENCY, with an examination of the recently enacted Gold Coin Bill; Delivered in the Lecture Room of the Franklin Institute, of the City of Philadelphia, on the 3d of July, 1834: By WILLIAM REED.—With an Appendix, containing the Act concerning the Gold Coins of the United States, &c., and a Table of the comparative Value of all Foreign Gold Coins, which are legal tenders. New York: Stodart, Courtland Street. For the Proprietor.—pp. 33.

(Continuation.)

We left the lecturer at that point where he called in Locke, Harris, Ricardo, and McCulloch, to sustain the preference of a silver standard—and the ambiguous Adam Smith, and the subtle Lord Liverpool, in favor of gold. We before noticed his calling in the authority of a Philadelphia friend, to back him in the notions, that “gold for this country, as the standard, might be attended with inconvenience.” And why, good reader, think you? In consequence of gold being the standard of England! Here is the beginning, the middle, and the end, of the lecturer’s logic. The man has no conception of any social action, but that which receives its impulse from the royal mint at the Tower, or the brokers of the Royal Exchange! And he adds, “with a good standard, we (that is, in Philadelphia,) should be exposed to the fluctuations, not only in our own (Philadelphia) currency, but in that of England also.”

It requires a peculiar obliquity of mind, to imagine that phrases thus strung together, could be received as reasoning or fact, by any man using his faculties in carrying instruction, much less conviction. If money be composed of metals universally desired, and the quantity by weight universally ascertainable, there can be neither uncertainty nor fluctuation, in the natural properties of the metals. If any variation be pretended, the necessary inference is, that it is a fraud, and not a reality. It is not necessary to imagine cases when money fluctuated by force and by fraud; there is no nation of Europe that has not been a victim of this royal vice.

Applying these sentiments to the mere allegations of the lecturer, we may concur in his notion of the probable fluctuations produced by brokers and bankers, and the select corps of loan and stock jobbers. It is ridiculous, therefore, to expect that those clans would be idle or innocent, whatever the standard might be—gold, or silver, or both.

The lecturer acknowledges that great diversity of opinion prevails on the choice of metals; but again adds, “No individual who will take the trouble of reflecting on the subject, could ever think of proposing to make both gold and silver the standard.”

The lecturer is superabundant of pragmatic assertion; but he does not condescend to offer any argument; his mode of demonstration is—“no individual who will take the trouble of reflecting” would do so and so. But the man does not reflect himself, else he must have known that gold and silver were the standards of England in the most prosperous days of her commerce and power; and that it was war and the paper system, which ruined both, and reduced the industrious classes of England to that state of poverty which renders an annual exportation necessary to counteract the progression of poverty.

We might say to the lecturer—sir, you are mistaken in your assumption, and you furnish no argument, no facts to sustain what you so coolly assert; the equilibrium of gold and silver is universal; forty years ago, the metals bore unequal ratios in different quarters of the globe; they were not in equal demand, nor in the same proportions;—yet, then England operated with both metals, as France, the richest country in gold and silver in the universe does now. No metal has a preference in France, but in cases of accommodation for transport, and fluctuation arising out of such incidents.

But he goes on: “Two standards of money;—you might as well speak of two standard yards,” one of thirty-six, and the other of thirty-four, inches; and so he goes on—but arrives at no conclusion, but that false one, that the standard of money of gold and silver, was like those two standard yards. But the lecturer did not perceive that the very argument he uses, stands in the way of his purpose: that gold and silver may be in unequal proportions, the history of China would inform us. If we had not so many other histories in Europe, from which we learn the fact, that all the changes have been the effects of artifice, fraud, or cupidity; and that it was not till Locke, and Lowndes, and Newton, and Harris, investigated the relations of money, that Europe learned to appreciate the importance of both the metals; and that it was by the knowledge which they developed, the European nations, were in a great measure governed in the regulation of the coinage. But Lord Liverpool has written “on the Coins of the Realm;” and his system has been adopted by the British government; and the lecturer seems to think that Lord Liverpool’s system should govern the world, though it stands in contradiction of Locke, and Harris, the latter of whom the lecturer quotes (p. 19,) thus—“The standard must invariably keep the same proportion of value, in all its parts; such is silver with respect to silver—and gold with respect to gold: that is, an ounce of silver is always just worth an ounce of silver; and two ounces of one or the other, always just double the value of the same. But silver and gold with respect to one another, are like other commodities, variable in their nature; and an ounce of gold that is worth a given quantity of silver to-day, may be worth more or less silver a while hence.”

Now, this extract presents nothing new nor to the purpose, if applied to China, at the period in which Harris lived. An ounce of gold was worth only twelve ounces of silver. But while the causes have ceased, and gold now brings sixteen for one in China, those causes are known to have been partial, and local, and proceeding out of the impurity of the gold which China had been most accustomed to receive, and some other incidents, not necessary to be cited. Harris states explicitly, the principle upon which we have always sustained the nature of value, “an ounce is worth an ounce;” but the variation between gold and silver, he says, varied in their nature. This phrase is vague; it was not in their nature, but in the mint systems, or the systems of royal brokers, like the Regent of Orleans. There must be some principle of proportion—if it be in the nature of the metals, how shall we ascertain that operation of nature? To seek the source of a stream, you travel to its head: and to determine the proportion of the metals, we must go to their fountain head. There nature has furnished the boundary—thence are their proportions diffused; and there it is, we find the foundation which nature has established—16 for 1: silver for gold. There is no fluctuation there; the fountains afford their supply, and their quantity, not legislation, determines their proportions, and their value in their weight—an ounce being every where worth an ounce, and sixteen ounces of silver being worth one ounce of gold.

But Lord Liverpool has determined it shall not be so in England, as the Dutch, in the seventeenth century, had succeeded in drawing the precious metals into Holland, and banking itself to destruction. Lord Liverpool laid a cunning scheme by which the English mint should be the floodgate, through which all the metals of the universe should pass. It was with such views, that the English monetary system was changed, in 1816, by the passage of a law for a new silver coinage. By this law, the pound troy of silver, which had before been coined into sixty-two shillings, was directed to be coined into sixty-six shillings; the effect of which, was to diminish the value of the pound of silver, equal to four shillings in the pound weight. Readers

who do not duly consider the signification of words, would consider this alteration from 62 to 64 shillings, as an augmentation, judging by the numerical quantity of shillings being increased from 62 to 66; but it will be obvious on a little reflection, that if there be 66 shillings in the same pound troy now, which was coined into 62 only before, that 62 shillings now must be as 4 is to 66 of less value; that is, simply the weight of the sterling must be more when it is the 62d part of a pound, than when it is in the 66th.

Now, these are occurrences which do not belong to the nature of the metals—they are arbitrary acts of men; and as there is no common law of nations to counteract human passions, there must be some universal law for commerce, and the wisdom of ages not to be traced to its source in antiquity, had already provided that universal law, that equivalent, that invariable standard, to which the power of tyrants and the stratagems of mercenary politicians, must bend, the institution of money of gold and silver.

It often requires a page of exposition to combat a paragraph of error; and as it is not improbable that we shall have missionaries to preach up the Bank gospel, there is a kind of necessity to meet them at the first dawn.

We draw hither, every year, the most interesting professors of the drama, with the most salutary influence on manners and taste; we may expect missionaries in Political Economy, and banking, and we must be prepared to give them a suitable reception. The lecturer before us, has broken ground, but has been rather unfortunate in his first campaign; and he has committed the fault of Charles XII. that while he calculated every thing upon his courage and his troops, he overlooked the necessity of a knowledge of the country and of human nature.

We deem it unnecessary to follow the lecturer through his rhapsody of figures, in p. 19, in which he assumes to be a prophet—though like too many of that craft, his words betray the absence of inspiration; he lays down a number of imaginary postulates, and resolves them with equal equanimity, but concludes that the inevitable consequence of such a state of things, (as he has imagined,) would be, that gold would be withdrawn from circulation. Has the Bank adopted the prophecy? Is the acceptance of gold, and the refusal to pay it out, a predetermined realization of the prophecy; or did the Bank, produce the inspiration?

One would almost suppose that this was spoken in the spirit, as it is so far as the United States Bank is concerned, a confirmation of the prediction, as that Bank has withdrawn, and refuses to issue, the gold coinage. But the prophet, not content with the hoarding of gold coin, goes farther: he insists that the two coins being in the field, “opens the door to fraud; that all commodities will fluctuate,” &c.—all of which predictions have already been absolutely falsified.

In pages 20, 21, and 22, the lecturer is really as incomprehensible as the man who, in his ravings, persuaded himself he was a tea-pot, and offered the demonstration by crooking his elbow, &c. There is nothing tangible, nothing that is rational, in them. In his early pages, he talked of a standard, and no standard—here, a standard is all his raving point; in p. 22, he suddenly returns to the law of 1791, from which he took such abrupt leave in p. 16, but only to fall into new rhapsodies and false prophecies. From these rhapsodies, we copy a few, as they furnish the best evidence of the man’s incapacity to discuss the subject.

“By the act of 1791, the dollar was to be 371½ grains of pure silver. On the 31st of this present July, (uttered on the 3d July,) the recently enacted gold bill takes effect.” In the true cant of the canters, he makes this apostrophe—“I trust, in heaven, for the sake of the honor of the country, (that is, Philadelphia,) the law will never be attempted to be carried into execution.” This good 20th of September, we can form a tolerably accurate measure

of the prophetic spirit which called on heaven, and who felt such keen concern for American honor, and can judge at once of his piety and his pretensions.

We shall not waste time in the exposition of cases that are imaginary, improbable, or ridiculous; nor the "motley circulation of foreign gold coins—guineas, sovereigns, Louis', Napoleons, doubloons, &c. of the genuineness of which, there can be hardly a possibility of judging. He does not perceive that this motley circulation must go to the crucible; that if a merchant should be so shallow as to accept them under value, he must be the loser; and that where he knows his business, the mint assay, or a re-coinage, saves him from all risks.

The lecturer does not know that the basis of all riches are the productions of the country, and the fund by which they levy profits on the commerce of the world; he seems to consider the whole world as composed of clans of brokers, upon whose midnight resolves the produce of the land and the sea, and the industry of the arts of the whole world revolve. But in p. 24, we have a resort to the lecturer's oracle, whom he thus quotes.

"I shall first call your attention to the manner in which an English (Scots) writer of great ability, Mr. McCulloch, Professor of Political Economy in the University of London, the crack-writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, [we mean hereafter to have a crack at this crack writer] of all articles treating of subjects connected with Political Economy, and who is reckoned a sort of oracle, and consulted by the present administration of England in all questions, &c." and then he quotes a quantity of matter that may be admitted without affecting the question, or denied without altering the conclusion; a sort of general truism, which may be true or not, as they apply to circumstances, but which show nothing in the case of the American gold law.

In like manner and with like effect, the lecturer refers to Harris; though the concluding sentences from Harris would serve as an answer to all he has uttered about it. "When the standard is altered," says Harris, "the course of exchange will set the matter right;" and how set it right? There can be no difficulty in the case, but where the reasoner is ignorant or closes his eyes against the truth. We shall supply what is wanting to arrive at a safe conclusion.

The standard of money undergoes an alteration, such as ours in the late laws.

Well, coin does not pass as coin abroad, but as bullion, then when our coin is sent abroad it is valued for exactly the pure contents.

Then it matters not to the world what we do with our standard, so we do not debase or falsify it, or say there is more gold than there is really, or less alloy than there is. How then are foreigners affected, if silver be, as the lecturer says, the preferable coin, why should foreigners grumble because we now give 16 instead of 15 ounces of silver for one gold ounce.

There is some unbecoming impertinence in p. 28, which we do not think worthy of further notice, having exposed the utter incapacity of the lecturer to comprehend that which he undertook to teach. The lecturer is but a smatterer even in the study of the subject of coin; he speaks of Edward I. of England, as the first who violated the standard. There was no gold coin in England till Edward III. who began to reign in 1326, Edward I. in 1272, nearly half a century before; but silver was debased in the reign of Stephen, 1135; near a century and a half before; and under the Conqueror, 1087, money was coined and debased; John was the first who regulated the silver coin so as to import a certain weight and purity, and he made the standard equal in Ireland to that of England. In the reign of Stephen, 1138, debasing the coin and usury, were punished by cutting off the hands.

We shall close our review with one number more. The delivery of such lectures is not to be deprecated; they

are useful, as they stir up thought and produce exposition that leads to truth; which should be the aim and end of all discussion.

We heard it distinctly stated yesterday evening, that the United States Bank has issued its mandate to the City Banks forbidding them from issuing gold coin in their transactions.

Two banks, it is said, have turned up trumps. The Moyamensing Bank is one; the other escaped our ear.

It is alleged that the Bank has been endeavouring to interfere with the management of the Mint. The Director is a man of exemplary life and integrity, and from thence we conclude that he will do his duty according to the instructions of those from whom he derives his authority.

OUTRAGE

Of Public Officers on the rights of Freemen.

READ, PAUSE, AND REFLECT!

Charles M. Morton being duly sworn, according to law, doth depose and say, that in consequence of information received, he waited on John Diehl, Clerk to the Commissioners for the erection of the new Alms House, to obtain the blacksmith work, about three or four weeks since. That on the 10th day of Sept. he received the note attached to this deposition, and obtained the certificate of John Cameron, also annexed, and called at the Alms House, where he saw Mr. Diehl, that said Diehl referred him to Mr. Govett, the superintendent, who, after some time passed in conversation, agreed to give him for the present one dollar a day, and if all things suited to increase it; that his name was then placed on the regular roll of the establishment, and deponent took board immediately opposite the building, with Mr. Moore, and gave up the situation he then held, with Mr. Eaton, of Kensington; that on Monday, the 15th inst. he was about commencing work, near breakfast time, when John Diehl, Clerk, called this deponent in his office, and said that he had understood this deponent was opposed to the present administration of the General Government—this deponent then asked who told him, to which he replied, I thought so from your conversation when you were here before; deponent replied that he said nothing of the kind. Mr. Diehl said he was then mistaken, for it was under that impression and condition, he had sent for him; that they had too many Jackson men at work already, and would have no more; and that this deponent could not have the work, so long as he continued a Jackson man, that if he, the deponent, would change his politics, and vote the opposition ticket, it would be the same as if deponent had never been a Jackson man, and that said Govett, superintendent aforesaid, did, on yesterday, the 16th inst. in the presence of Mathias Slemmer, say, that in consequence of the political principles of this deponent, he could not have the work.

CHARLES MORTON.

Affirmed and subscribed before me, this 17th day of September, A. D. 1834.

JOHN R. WALKER, Alderman.

Mathias Slemmer being duly sworn, says, that on the 16th of this month, he accompanied Charles M. Morton to the new Alms House, and there saw Mr. Govett, who, in the presence of this deponent, did say, that he, the said Govett had employed Charles Morton, as a blacksmith, but that he could not go to work, on account of his political principles; and that said Charles had come to work agreeably to the contract made with him; that the said Morton then remarked, he could not deny his principles for any man, when Govett stated he could do nothing for him.

MATHIAS SLEMMER.

Sworn before me, this 17th day of September, 1834.

JOHN R. WALKER, Alderman.

NEW ALMS HOUSE, Sept. 10th, 1834.

Mr. Charles Morton, Blacksmith.

Sir—I am instructed to say, that if you will call here at as early a period as you can, you will most probably be able to get a situation that may last through the winter.

Yours, &c.

JOHN DIEHL,

Clerk of the Commissioners.

P. S. It would perhaps be well for you to bring a line from Mr. Cameron, with whom you say you have worked.

PHILADELPHIA, Sept. 10, 1834.

This is to certify that Charles Morton has worked for me a length of time, and found him a sober and industrious man.

JOHN CAMERON.

From the Gloucester Democrat.

THE WHIG LEADERS.

Caleb Foote, Editor of the *Salem Gazette and Mercury*, is generally correct in his references to history, whenever a strong party bias does not warp his better judgment. It gives us great pleasure to compliment this intelligent and judicious opponent upon the fairness and justice of the view he takes of the character of the whig party and their leaders, and of their feelings and conduct towards the United States of America. The accuracy of the interesting statement of the important facts contained in the following paragraph, is also undeniable; and we cheerfully admit the great force of the argument to be drawn from them in favor of the right of the British Bank party to take the name of the whig party. That Mr. Foote does not underrate the value, or mistake the bearing of these facts, is evident from his making them the subject of the leading editorial article, and indeed of almost the only political article in his last Mercury.

Mr. Foote claims the honor of being the first to introduce the application of the terms whig and tory as they are at present used by the British Bank party and this Honor has lately been awarded to him in the *New England Magazine*. Mr. Foote introduced these whimsical epithets to the service of the bank party in his notice of a meeting of freemen opposed to the usurpations and tyranny of the Autocrat Nicholas, published in his paper of the first of April last. He then called these men, among whom were many of his oldest and best friends, Tories! We thought at the time it was an April fool joke, like the reference to an invisible chapter of *Habakuk*, found in the same paper; and we thought the one almost as irreverent as the other.

He has since, however, concluded to be serious, in what was doubtless at first meant for a joke—because the converse term has been caught up by a party which was just then heartily ashamed and tired and sick of their last three or four names, and looking out eagerly for a new alias—though it had not then occurred to them, till he suggested it, that they were driven from every inch of American ground and must take shelter under the British flag.

It will be recollected that there has been no avowed whig party in this country since the Constitution, except for the last five months. Though many men have been accused by their enemies of partiality to Britain and British Institutions, yet it is only since last April fool day, that any man in America has had the hardihood to call himself a whig and to avow whig principles.

And what are whig principles? The first and fundamental whig principle is—A STRICT ADHERENCE TO THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION—as established at the Revolution of 1688, spoken of by Rufus Choate in his Jubilate as Glorious—which seated a black-hearted, hypocritical, lying, canting, stammering Dutchman upon the throne of Great Britain. This includes Devotion to a hereditary monarchy, a hereditary aristocracy, a church establishment, Union of Church and State, and the rotten borough system as handed down from the said glorious Revolution. Those who dislike all these things are called by the whigs, radicals, and sometimes Democrats, which is the name they gave to Horne Tooke the friend of American Independence, and to other politicians of his class.

But we detain the reader too long from Mr. Foote's excellent article. The father of the new nomenclature is also its defender—and here is this defence.

From the *Salem Mercury*, Wednesday, Sept. 10th. Editorial.

"It is a fact not generally known, that Earl Grey was one of the principal authors in his public capacity, of the restrictive measure which led to the late war between Great Britain and this country. The British Orders in Council and the French Decrees, between which neutral commerce was annihilated and American rights so flagrantly violated, were, as is well remembered, vindicated by each belligerent, as measures of retaliation for previous wrongs done by the other. The primitive official wrong, as is now understood, was the blockade doctrine asserted in 1806, in the proclamation of the blockade of the mouths of the Prussian rivers, and in subsequent extension along the French coast and to the Mediterranean.

This was the first act of the Coalition Ministry of 1806, and it is a remarkable fact, that the two ministers by whom these measures were officially carried into effect, rank as the two most able liberal statesmen that England has ever produced. Mr. Fox was the Secretary for foreign affairs, and EARL GREY (then Lord Howick) the first Lord of the Admiralty, when the first blockade was proclaimed. On the death of Mr. Fox, Lord Howick succeeded him, and carried out the doctrines to that extremity, by which this country suffered so much. In the war then carried on against the French, whig and tory seemed, whenever in power, to consider all means lawful, and all doctrines justifiable which could be used against Napoleon."

It will be remembered that Charles James Fox was the acknowledged leader of the whigs, both for talent and influence, throughout the whole of his long public life, commencing in his minority, and closing only when he slept into the grave: that

after his death, Earl Grey, then Lord Howick, became and continued their leader, until he resigned the highest office in Great Britain, a few weeks ago: and that the *Grey-Fox* ministry, spoken of by Mr. Foote, was the only period that the whigs have been in power for many years, until the last eighteen months, or thereabouts. The points of resemblance will then be striking. The principal are the following:

First. The whigs of Great Britain, (Fox and Grey being leaders in it) passed the orders in Council which caused the late war.

The British party in America, to which Mr. Foote belongs, justified the orders in council, or at least pronounced the British to be right, and their own country wrong, in the war which grew out of them.

Second. Grey and Fox, and the whigs at their heels, condemned and opposed the policy of Jefferson and Madison. The British party in this country, now calling themselves whigs, did the same—they followed their leaders, Fox and Grey, faithfully—and they have not yet ceased to revile the illustrious Jefferson, though he has been dead nine years—witness the Salem Gazette, the organ of the party in Essex county—the Boston Courier, the organ of the party in Suffolk—and “Familiar Letters,” a volume of near five hundred pages, published in Boston, by William Sullivan, the candidate of the party for the mayorship of the city, and devoted to two objects—the one to abuse and vilify Thomas Jefferson: the other, to prove the most perfect and exact political resemblance between Jefferson and Jackson.

Third. Fox and Burke, formerly an unprincipled coalition, with their bitterest opponents, for the sake of gaining and holding power. So did Webster, and Clay, with their bitterest opponents, Calhoun, Poindexter, and Preston—and for the same purposes. In Great Britain, it was Fox and Burke, and not their opponents, who sacrificed principle for power—in America, it was Webster and Clay, and not Calhoun and Preston—Poindexter never had any.

Fourth. The coalition not of 1806, but of 1783, ruined both the parties to it: so will that of 1834. Neither party to the disgraceful compact, carried into the coalition the strength which it could command alone. Divided, they might have stood—united they fell. “Although this, to all intents and purposes, was a whig administration,” says the historian, “yet the coalition of Messrs. Fox and Burke with Lord North, whom they had been for so many years denouncing, appeared such a total abandonment of public principle, as at once to deprive it of all public confidence—and the public confidence, once lost, is never completely regained.” These remarks apply with equal force to the coalition of Clay and Webster, with Calhoun. Fox had threatened North with the scaffold—for power he joined him. Webster had threatened the Nullifiers with the gibbet—in his speech of January 21, 1830, he said to Haynes, “it is rather an awkward business, this dying without touching the ground! After all, that is a sort of hemp tax, worse than any part of the tariff.” For power, this man joined the nullifiers, whom he would have hanged.

Fifth. The coalition of 1783 was dissolved with manifestations of mutual contempt and hatred, and the parties to it opposed each other more bitterly afterwards than before. The same is true of the coalition of 1834. The men for whom Mr. Webster recommended a halter has not forgiven the insult—the Calhounites, to a man, abhor the author and defender of “the bloody bill”—and if Poindexter felt “nothing” for Mr. Webster “but entire contempt” before the coalition, how must his “contempt” have been increased, when Mr. Webster degraded himself so low as to choose the moral monster to preside over himself and his colleagues!

Sixth. The whigs of Great Britain thought all measures justifiable that could be used against Napoleon. The British Bank party think all measures justifiable against Jackson, and as truth cannot injure him, they have concerted systematic issue of falsehood upon a vastly larger scale than the world ever saw before.

In view of these resemblances, Mr. Foote may ask exultingly, are we not whigs? We answer, No! You have made out a strong case, but look a little further. Though you are a good deal like whigs, yet you are much more like Tories, and if you have, as surely you deserve a British name, it must be Tory. The Tories believe in the indefeasible rights of the King and of the house of Lords. You believe in the indefeasible rights of the Rag Autocrat and his Lords—who sit not by the leave, but against the will, of their states. The Tories are especially zealous to have a bench of bishops seated in the house of Lords to represent the Church—you are just as zealous to have one fourth or fifth part of our House of Lords sit not to represent states, but the Bank, which is your Church, just as your God is Mammon. The Tories are the peculiar champions of all monopolies; so are you. The Tories are most in favor of high duties, of making all improvements by the Government and trusting nothing to the people. So are you. The Tories love the House of Lords and hate the House of Commons. So do you. The

Tories wish the Prime Minister to be the puppet of the king and trust to their influence over the King. You wish the President, who is our Prime Minister, to be the puppet of Nicholas, and you trust to your influence with Old Nick. The Tories were turned out of office by the reformers. So were you. The Tories swear most falsely that there has been no reform, but that every thing is going to ruin. So do you. The Tories have not sense enough to find out when they are beaten, but live and die in the faith of “GREAT REACTIONS”—about which they have been prating this year and a half. So do you. The Tories sometimes call themselves “Conservatives.” So do you. The Tories say they have “all the wealth, all the learning, all the talents and all the decency.” So do you. They are a little mistaken in this. So are you. Finally, the Tories have lied so long they do not know how to tell the truth. Just so is it with you. Therefore, Gentlemen corruptionists, you must sit down contented under the name of **BRITISH BANK TORIES**—for there is no other name in history that so fully expresses your character.

From the Globe.

VIOLATION OF THE LAWS.

SENATOR SOUTHARD.

We resume our purpose of exposing the violations of law committed by this man in the management of the public money, while he was Secretary of the Navy.

Item. When Mr. Southard assumed the duties of the Secretary of the Navy, he took an oath to discharge the duties of the office faithfully, according to law. According to law, appropriations of public money are made by Congress for the support of the Navy, under certain specific heads or names, and for certain specific purposes. Thus, there is one appropriation, called “Pay and Subsistence,” in which is included all the monthly pay of officers and men, and such extra rations as are paid to them in money. There is another for “Provisions;” another for “Medicines and Hospital Stores;” another for “Repairs of Vessels;” another for “Gradual Improvement of the Navy;” another for “Contingent Expenses,” and so on. An act, passed 3d March, 1829, provides as follows, viz.

“The sums appropriated by law for each branch of expenditure, in the several departments, shall be solely applied to the objects for which they are respectively appropriated, and to no other.”

An act, passed May 1st, 1820, contains the following provision, namely.

“That the President shall be also further authorized to direct a portion of the monies, appropriated for any of the following branches of expenditure in the Naval Department, viz. For “Provisions,” for “Medicine and Hospital Stores,” for “Repairs of Vessels,” for “Clothing,” to be applied to any other of the abovementioned branches of the expenditure, in the same Department; and that no transfers of appropriation, from or to other branches of expenditure, shall be hereafter made.”

The same act contains the following requisition, viz.

“That it shall be the duty of the Secretaries of War and the Navy Departments to lay before Congress, on the first day of February of each year, a statement of the appropriations of the preceding year, for their Departments respectively, showing the amount appropriated under each specific head of appropriation, the amount expended under each, and the balance remaining unexpended,” &c.

These laws were in force while Mr. Southard was Secretary of the Navy, and he was sworn to obey them. He had no legal authority whatever to transfer monies from one appropriation to another, or expend those monies for other purposes than those for which they were appropriated.

Now, we aver, and we are ready to prove it, that Mr. Southard did, in numerous cases, transfer public monies from one appropriation to another, in direct violation of law; and did, in like manner, cause them to be expended for other objects than those for which they were appropriated. Not to be accused of making a vague charge, we will specify cases in which such transfers were made, and challenge Mr. Southard to an investigation of them.

On the 28th March, 1828, Mr. Southard advanced \$40,000 to the Navy Agent at New York out of the appropriation for “Pay of the Navy, afloat,” and directed him immediately to deposit it in the Treasury again under the head of “Gradual Improvement of the Navy.” This was a direct transfer of \$40,000 from one appropriation to another in a case where even the President had not the legal power.

On the 10th of April, 1828, Mr. Southard advanced to George MacDaniel, Special Agent, \$20,000 out of the appropriation for “building ten sloops of war,” and at the same time directed him to deposit it in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for “Gradual Increase of the Navy.” Here was another transfer in

a case where the President himself did not possess the legal power.

On the 10th of June, 1828, Mr. Southard advanced to the Navy Agent at Philadelphia, \$4,000 out of the appropriation for “Pay of the Navy Afloat,” and directed him to deposit it in the Treasury under the head of “Gradual Increase of the Navy.” Here again, was a transfer which even the President had no power to make.

December 4th, 1828, Mr. Southard advanced to George MacDaniel \$48,229 90 out of the appropriation for “Gradual Improvement of the Navy,” and directed him to deposit under the head of “gradual increase of the navy.” Here again a power was assumed which did not belong even to the President.

To show how reckless of all law Mr. Southard was in the management of the funds appropriated for the service of his Department, we give another case of transfer. On the 27th of October, 1827, he addressed a letter to the Fourth Auditor to the following effect:—viz.

“I have the honor to inform you that I have this day caused a requisition to be issued in favor of Mr. George MacDaniel, special agent, for \$65,594 06, under the head of provisions, being the balance due from pay afloat to the Naval Hospital fund. I have to request the necessary transfer in the settlement of Mr. MacDaniel’s account.”

Here he committed a double violation of law. First, he virtually transferred \$65,594 06 from “Provisions” to “Pay Afloat,” and in the second place, instead of using the money for the purchase of provisions, as the law directed, he applied it to another and very different purpose.

The latter he was constantly in the habit of doing, as well as making transfers. In February, 1828, the Navy agent at New York wanted \$40,000 under the head of “Pay of the Navy afloat,” and Mr. Southard sent it to him out of the appropriation for the “Gradual Improvement of the Navy,” directing him to expend it for the former object, which he did!

So in January of that year, the sum of \$10,697 86 was due to the contractor for slop clothing at Boston, out of the appropriation for “Pay of the Navy afloat;” but Mr. Southard paid it out of the appropriation for the purchase of provisions.

Thus, although the law expressly prohibits transfers in all these cases, and declares that the monies “shall be SOLELY applied to the objects for which they are respectively appropriated, and NO OTHER,” yet did Mr. Southard totally disregard these laws which he had sworn to obey, make transfers at will and apply the monies as he pleased! These direct violations of law were in 1828 carried by Mr. Southard to the extent of \$80,000, and had been much more in previous years! The amount expended for contingencies alone, beyond the whole amount appropriated by Congress for that object, exceeds the following sums: namely.

In 1824	-	-	-	-	-	\$9,000
1825	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
1826	-	-	-	-	-	57,000
1827	-	-	-	-	-	52,000
1828	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
						\$237,000

This was all taken out of other appropriations, by Mr. Southard, IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF POSITIVE LAW!

To enable himself to carry on this game, he annually committed a double fraud upon Congress! He purposely sent in estimates for much more money than he needed under some heads of appropriation, particularly provisions, for no other purpose than that he might get the money to spend for other objects in violation of law; and in the annual reports to Congress he caused the purposes to which the money was applied to be stated falsely. For instance: he caused the \$10,697 86 paid a contractor at Boston for clothing to be reported as expended for the purchase of provisions. He caused the \$65,594 06 transferred in October, 1827, from “Provisions” to “Pay Afloat,” through the agency of Mr. MacDaniel, to be reported to Congress as paid away for provisions. So in every case where a transfer was made, or money appropriated for one object was applied to another, he caused a report to be made to Congress which he knew to be false.

And this man, who knowingly and wilfully violated the laws almost every day of his public life, and filled the public records with falsehoods, has the assurance to charge President Jackson with violating the constitution and laws, and accuse him of a want of truth.

We do not make vague charges as he does; but we point out particular acts. We defy him to have them investigated, and we call on the People of New Jersey to insist that he shall do it. He may thank those whom he abuses, that he has not long since, been impeached, and disqualified from holding any office in the Republic!

We have not done with him.

From the *Armstrong Democrat*.
THE SCHOOL LAW.

Mr. CROLL:—Feeling myself incapable of doing justice to this subject, has prevented me for some time from attempting to say any thing on it, through the columns of the public press. I have, however, held myself in readiness to defend the law if assailed by any one through your columns. Finding, however, that none have yet ventured through them to express their disapprobation of this law; and also finding a few persons very diligent in endeavouring to raise all the opposition to it which they can, by representing it in an untrue light, has now induced me thus publicly to attempt exposing two or three of those untrue representations of the law which are now attempted to be circulated throughout this country.

In the first place this law is represented to be an "arbitrary," and an "aristocratic" law, and not congenial to a "free people." Aristocratic! when left to the people whether to adopt it or not? It is no law, at all, only to those counties and townships that adopt it. If any county or township should not adopt it, such will have no school tax to pay more than they have under the existing laws. And if adopted, how is it arbitrary? What is compulsory about it more than to pay the tax? Is it irrevocable if found not advantageous? No. It can be adopted one year and rejected the next. Is every man who has children compelled to send them to those schools. No none are.

The legislature have not enforced this law on the people. They have only made, recommended, and submitted it to the people, for their adoption or rejection, by a vote of the people themselves. Indeed this law might be viewed as a charter, to protect such divisions or districts as establish free schools. But as a law the legislature of Pennsylvania never passed one by a more unanimous vote. Nor did it ever pass one on more purely republican principles, or more congenial to a free and an enlightened people.

Secondly, it is represented that by the establishment of this law, that the tax created by it will "four times exceed the amount of our county tax." Now, for the satisfaction of those who have not investigated this matter, I will show something near how far this is from being correct. The law only requires double the amount appropriated to be raised by a tax. The amount appropriated to the whole state is *seventy-five thousand dollars*. Now, agreeable to the census of 1830, that amount would fall a little short of *one thousand dollars* to Armstrong county. But the more rapid increase of taxable inhabitants in this county than in many other counties in the state, will make the proportionable part of this county, in all probability, *one thousand dollars*.

Upon the most accurate calculation that can now be made, \$1,000 will be the dividend to this county. Now if [as I have no doubt] all the townships in this county should adopt this law, it will require a tax of \$2,000 to be assessed, which is not [as correctly as I can ascertain] the *one half* amount of our county tax; it is only about the *one third* of what our county tax was two years since, that is county, state and personal tax, all of which are included and collected with or as county tax. The *one half* at furthest of what we pay as county tax, is the *enormous* tax imposed by the adoption of this school law. It will be near about *ten cents* per head of a tax for each individual in the county. It will average about the price of a bushel of corn from each family. Should this be startling to any one? Most certainly not, when we take a view of the advantages to be derived from it.

In the state of New York, where free schools are established and flourishing well, the salaries of teachers are on an average something under twelve dollars per month. Supposing the salaries of teachers to average eleven dollars per month in this county, and not allowing anything for the erection of school houses, which I trust will not be necessary in this county at present, as it is hoped there are now a sufficient number of school houses erected in this county to accommodate to the extent that the school fund will now reach; and that the inhabitants of each neighborhood where a school is established, will make any repairs that may be necessary thereto, and furnish it with fuel, &c., without applying to the school fund.—Taking this view of the subject, three thousand dollars will establish, **FOR FOUR MONTHS IN EACH YEAR, SIXTY-EIGHT FREE SCHOOLS IN ARMSTRONG COUNTY**, which will average nearly six schools to each township.

Compare the advantages to be derived from those fifty eight free schools, to the one half amount of our county tax—to ten cents per head from each individual—to the price of one bushel of corn from each family, and how insignificant do the latter appear. Where is the man, although he may have a large tax to pay—although he may have no children to send to school—although he may have educated all his family at his own expense; and who is a lover of his country—who is a friend to knowledge, and who possesses a spark of that patriotic feeling which ought

to distinguish a Pennsylvanian—whose heart will not expand while he is paying a tax to be devoted to so laudable an object—an object on which the wealth, welfare and republican principles of our state so much depend? If we have such men, it might truly be said, of such Pennsylvania need not be proud.

It is also represented that if this law is adopted, and schools established, that the people will be *compelled* to send their children to school—than which a more absurd idea could not be taken from this law. There is no such clause in the law, nor any thing that has the least bearing thereto. But it is a fact that it is thus represented to those who do not or cannot read the law. And what is most to be regretted is, that these representations are first given to it by some of those who do, or ought best to understand it in its true light.

As a friend to this law—as a friend to the advancement of knowledge—as a friend to the true interests of this county—I sincerely invite and entreat each citizen to read and examine this law for himself—make himself conversant with all its sections and provisions—view it in its true light—and in addition to its great importance, it will most certainly be found to contain a beauty and mildness much greater than characterize almost any preceding law.

I will now close this epistle with the hope that you will again hear from
PHILANDER.

From the *Standard of Union*.

WHAT GOOD HAS NULLIFICATION DONE?

We might well ask, what evil has it not inflicted, and what further mischief does it not contemplate against the liberty and happiness of our Country?

It is now more than three years, since the doctrine was openly avowed in South Carolina, and became the leading feature of her politics. Having soon gained the ascendancy, it thereby placed in the hands of its votaries, the means of making a full and fair experiment of its sanitary effects upon the errors and abuses of the government.

It was announced to the people, as peaceful and constitutional; as containing the magic power of eradicating the evils of unjust or unwise legislation; of countervailing or abrogating the laws of the United States, without agitation or violence; and accordingly, the ruling men of Carolina, were soon called on to apply this potent remedy to the existing burdens of the tariff.

A convention was assembled, from which, her hood-winked and deluded citizens were fondly anticipating a speedy and total relief from their burdens, by the peaceful and constitutional operation of this infallible remedy.

The convention met, and to the astonishment of those who had gone blindly into the doctrine, without duly considering its pernicious tendency, or without understanding the ultimate object of their leaders, the very first substantive act of this quiet and anti-belligerent assembly, was a virtual declaration of war against the United States, by raising an army, and tendering an issue of force to the federal government; and the tariff was forthwith—what? nullified? oh no, the tariff was not nullified by the convention of South Carolina. Nullification was abandoned by the very men who had pronounced it the great conservative principle, and who had scouted the very idea of secession. But what did they do? Why they wound up the farce, by resorting to that very secession which they had repudiated, resolving to secede from the Union on the 1st day of February, 1833, provided the duties on imports were not by that time, reduced indiscriminately to a fair revenue standard.

But how was her secession to be accomplished? Peaceably you would say, if not constitutionally. Not so. This substitute for nullification; this dismemberment of the Union, in lieu of the peaceful and constitutional corrective of nullification, was to be perpetrated at the point of the bayonet. Military arrangements were set on foot—arms and munitions of war were provided—soldiers were raised—the gauntlet of defiance was thrown down to the general government—"with all the pomp and circumstance of glorious war."

In the mean time, the States of this Union, anxiously looking to the eccentric movements of South Carolina, had authoritatively declared, "THE FEDERAL UNION MUST BE PRESERVED." Here was a dilemma, from which the omnipotence of nullification itself could not relieve her. To go forward was defeat, to go backwards, disgrace; and accordingly she poised herself where she stood, resolving to trust her fate to the chapter of accidents, to cover her retreat from a position to which she had been hurried by the reckless spirit of her leaders.

She suspended her ordinance, accepted the compromise; submitted to the burdens of the tariff for nine years more, and thereby gave the country a practical illustration of the total incompetency and impracticability of nullification as a remedy for unjust and unconstitutional laws. We say a practical illustration, because, the convention was gotten up by the nullifiers—it was composed of the nullifiers—the object was nullification as openly

avowed from one end of the State to the other—the power was in their hands—a fit and proper case was before them as they asserted for the application of their remedy, and yet they did not nullify the tariff, but wound up the scene by a threat of secession. After all this, if any man can believe in nullification as a salutary and efficient principle of government, we envy not his credulity.

But the evils resulting from the prevalence of nullification are not half told. It has alienated the affections of the people from their government, and weakened the confidence of thousands in the great fundamental principles which lie at the foundation of our political institutions—It has engendered a spirit of disunion and discord, tending to a severance of the Union, to anarchy and civil commotion.

It has dissevered the bonds of private friendship—invaded the circle of domestic happiness—arrayed the father against the son, and the brother against the brother—nor has the holy sanctuary escaped its fiery visitations. Men who once worshipped at the same altar—who mingled their prayers and thanksgivings to the throne of the eternal—who united their supplications for faith in this world and salvation in the next, are now strangers and aliens from each other. And such is the angry spirit of nullification—and such the deplorable state of society in South Carolina, brought on by this firebrand of discord.

We might stop here, but the picture is not full. And we ask, where are those *sixty or seventy thousand people* who have emigrated from South Carolina, within the last three years? They are gone, and forever, from the land of their birth and the home of their fathers, to seek peace and quiet among strangers. They have fled away from the wrath of nullification leaving nothing behind, but friendships dissolved—affections broken—confidence destroyed—religion prostrated, and a country ruined.

This, fellow citizens, is no fancy sketch, but a faithful history of the effects of nullification upon the interests and happiness of the people of Carolina, not to speak of the test oath and the enormous debt which her military preparations have accumulated upon her people, and which in the shape of taxes, they will sooner or later be called on to bear.

Let any man compare South Carolina now, with her condition five years ago, and tell us what she has gained by nullification. Let him compare the condition of her citizens with those of Georgia, and ask himself, if he is prepared for the same round of confusion and mischief in his own state? if he is willing to trust the interests and happiness of a people, in the full enjoyment of heaven's richest bounties to the hazardous experiment of nullification, with a knowledge of its disastrous results upon a neighboring state? We trust not.

Nullification has been weighed in the balance and found wanting—it has had a fair trial in one state—and thank God in one only; and that one, it has carried to the verge of ruin. May Georgia learn wisdom from experience and shun the evils of nullification.

Those who have looked with an unprejudiced eye into the internal condition of South Carolina for several years past, and marked its civil distraction, its social discord, the unrelenting proscription of the dominant party, must conclude that not a tythe of the evil thus inflicted could ever have been produced by all the tariffs that have been enacted since the origin of the system.—*Southern Advocate*.

MEMORANDUMS.

PHILADELPHIA,
ELIZABETH ST.—NEAR SOUTH SIXTH. }

This paper is published in the quarto form—

Because it is more commodious for perusal than the folio;
Because it is better adapted for preservation, and reference; and
Because it can be more easily enlarged without affecting its convenience, by the mere lengthening of the columns, or by the addition of a quarter or half sheet, or more, if eligible.

The publication in detached numbers, is incident to the progress of the subscription; which, though it proceeds slow, goes on certain.

NUMBERS will continue to be issued, at convenient times, till the subscription shall be adequate to the expenditure, when the paper will issue daily, without any farther notice; and the detached numbers will be considered each as a day, in the year's charge.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION—Eight Dollars per annum; \$5, to be paid in advance. The paper to be issued daily, when the subscription covers the expense.

ADVERTISING on moderate terms, by the line, square, or column;—by the day, week, month, quarter, or year.

FOR SALE.

NO. 503, Dec. 1833.—SAMUEL REYNOLDS vs. JOHN COOK. (C.) Award of Arbitrators. Filed, May 13, 1834.—\$35,475 25. Apply to SAMUEL REYNOLDS, No. 74, South Eleventh street. July 10—if

A few remaining copies of the VISIT TO COLUMBIA by the Editor, for sale at the office at two dollars per copy.